REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,201,443 to Tanji (hereinafter Tanji) in view of U.S. Patent 5,889,432 to Ho (hereinafter Ho).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanji in view of Ho as applied to claims 1,2 and 4-12 and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art as represented in Fig. 1 (AAPA).

Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejections presented by the final Office Action for the same reasons presented in the response filed on June 30, 2004, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has misinterpreted Applicant's previous remarks concerning Tanji. In particular, Applicant suggests that the Examiner has attempted a double inclusion by first citing amplifier circuit 20 of Tanji, presumably in comparison to the inductive amplifier circuit of Applicant's Claim 1, while also citing transistors M1 and M2, presumably in comparison to the feed-forward boost circuit, also of Applicant's Claim 1.

Thus, since Tanji's amplifier circuit 20 already includes transistors M1 and M2, the Examiner necessarily requires Tanji's amplifier circuit 20 to be cited against both the first and second elements of Applicant's Claim 1. Such a necessity constitutes a double inclusion of amplifier circuit 20 in order for the Examiner to show correspondence to Applicant's Claim 1, which is erroneous.

Further, Applicant suggests that the combination of Ho with Tanji does not remedy the deficiencies of Tanji as admitted by the Examiner, i.e., that "Tanji does not show the use of inductors." The Examiner, therefore, combines Ho with Tanji, since Ho teaches the use of inductors "to block AC to and from the power supply voltage." This use of inductors, however, has no relation to Applicant's claimed invention, which is at least to "[increase] the gain at high frequencies" through use of the inductors. Thus, the Examiner has failed to demonstrate that the combination of Ho and Tanji teaches or suggests all of Applicant's claimed limitations in contrast to M.P.E.P. §2143.

Still further, in regards to the new claims, the final Office Action is silent as to how the combination of Ho and Tanji teaches or suggests all of the limitations, such as those in claim 13. In particular, that "the boost stage is adapted to draw a variable current from the intermediate output nodes in response to a frequency of the input signal to modify a magnitude of the output current drawn." In other words, that the variable current modifies the magnitude of the output current drawn in response to the frequency of the input signal. No showing is made that Tanji teaches or suggests these limitations.

Tanji appears to require the use of a separate control signal, VCONP and VCONN, to steer the current between transistor pairs M1M2 and M3M4. (See column 3, lines 26-40). Likewise, Ho appears to require the use of a separate control signal, V_AGC 210, to steer the current between current paths 104L and 104R. (See column 3, lines 16-25). Thus, neither of Tanji nor Ho, relies on the frequency of the input signal to steer current. Rather each rely on the use of a separate control signal to steer current.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested in view of the Remarks presented above. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Kanzaki
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 37,652
(408) 879-6149

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 18, 2004.

Pat Slaback
Name

Pat Slaback
Signature